IN THE UNITED	STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE NORTHER	RN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
ELLA MAE MICHELE DAIGLE,	) No. C 12-4270 JSW (PR)	
Petitioner,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE	
vs.	)	
WALTER MILLER, Warden,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	) _)	
INT	TRODUCTION	
Petitioner is a California prisone	er proceeding pro se, and she has filed a pro se	
habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U	as corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. She has paid the filing fee.	
Respondent is ordered to show cause w	condent is ordered to show cause why the petition should not be granted.	
BACKGROUND		
In 2010, a jury in Santa Clara County Superior Court convicted Petitioner of		
second-degree robbery. Based on this convictions and sentencing enhancements, the tria		
court sentenced her to a term of 11 years in state prison. Petitioner's appeals to the		
California Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of California were denied in 2010 and		
2011 respectively.		
DISCUSSION		
I <u>Standard of Review</u>	Standard of Review	
This court may entertain a petition	on for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a	
person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is		

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." *Id.* § 2243.

## II <u>Legal Claims</u>

As grounds for federal habeas relief, Petitioner claims: (1) that there was insufficient evidence that she had knowledge that a crime was convicted; (2) that there was insufficient evidence to support an aiding and abetting theory of liability; and (3) the prosecutor failed to prove her guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The claims are sufficient to require a response from Respondent. It appears that there may be substantial overlap between the third claim and Petitioner's other two claims. Respondent may address the third claim separately or in conjunction with the first two claims.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

- 1. The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition, and all attachments thereto, on Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The Clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on Petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner, within **eighty-four** (84) days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted based upon the claims in the petition. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on Petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition. If Petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on Respondent within **twenty-eight (28) days** of the date the answer is filed.
  - 4. Respondent may, within eighty-four (84) days, file a motion to dismiss on

1	procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to	
2	Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If Respondent files such a motion,	
3	Petitioner shall file with the Court and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of	
4	non-opposition within twenty-eight (28) days of the date the motion is filed, and	
5	Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner a reply within fourteen (14)	
6	days of the date any opposition is filed.	
7	4. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep	
8	the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice	
9	of Change of Address." He must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion.	
10	Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant	
11	to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13	DATED: October 23, 2012	
14	JEF/RHY 8. WHITE United States District Judge	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	3	

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE		
3	NORTHERN D	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4			
5 6	ELLA MAE DAIGLE,	Case Number: CV12-04270 JSW	
7	Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
8	V.		
9	WALTER MILLER et al,		
0	Defendant.		
11 12 13 14 15	Court, Northern District of California.  That on October 23, 2012, I SERVED a treating copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope	n an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District rue and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by , or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office office.	
16 17 18 19 20	Ella Mae Michele Daigle WA3794 P.O. Box 92 Chowchilla, CA 93610 Dated: October 23, 2012	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			